

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Peter L. Fear,

Plaintiff,

v.

United States of America,

Defendant.

No. 2:18-cv-02333-KJM-DB

Orlonzo Hedrington,

Plaintiff,

v.

County of Solano, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:21-cv-00414-KJM-DB

Orlonzo Hedrington,

Plaintiff,

v.

David Grant Medical Center, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:22-cv-00074-KJM-DB

Orlonzo Hedrington,

Plaintiff,

v.

Veteran's Administration of the United States
of America, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 1:22-cv-01425-KJM-DB

ORDER

1 In case No. 2:18-cv-2333, Orlonzo Hedrington requests the undersigned recuse from
2 hearing “all” his cases. ECF No. 79. The court interprets that request as applying to all of the
3 related cases in the caption above.

4 Cases 2:18-cv-2333 and 2:21-cv-0414 are closed, so the recusal request is denied as moot
5 in those cases. With respect to cases 2:22-cv-0074 and 2:22-cv-1425, district judges must recuse
6 from hearing a case if their “impartiality might reasonably be questioned” or if they have a
7 “personal bias or prejudice against a party.” *United States v. \$292,888.04 in U.S. Currency*,
8 54 F.3d 564, 566 (9th Cir. 1995). But judges have an obligation not to recuse themselves in some
9 cases; that obligation “is perhaps at its highest” if a party requests recusal after “an adverse ruling
10 in the course of the action.” *United States v. Sierra Pac. Indus.*, 759 F. Supp. 2d 1198, 1205–06
11 (E.D. Cal. 2010). Hedrington’s request fits that description. He pursues recusal based on judicial
12 rulings and decisions in the cases above.

13 The court orders as follows:

- 14 (1) The court construes the filing at ECF No. 79 in Case No. 2:18-cv-2333 as applying
15 to all of the related cases in the caption above;
16 (2) The request is **denied as moot** in case Nos. 2:18-cv-2333 and 2:21-cv-0414; and
17 (3) The request is **denied** in case Nos. 2:22-cv-0074 and 2:22-cv-1425.

18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 DATED: July 5, 2023.

20 
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE